IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE NASHVILLE DIVISION

ARCENTO SHELTON and CARLOS BALLENTINE,)) Case No.
Plaintiffs,	JudgeMagistrate JudgeJURY DEMAND
v.) JUNI DEMAND
HYUNDAI SUBARU OF NASHVILLE, INC., MARTIN CADILLAC, INC. d/b/a Martin)
Automotive Group and RON REINHART,)
Defendants.)

COMPLAINT

For their Complaint against defendants Hyundai Subaru of Nashville, Inc., Martin Cadillac, Inc. d/b/a Martin Automotive Group and Ron Reinhart ("defendants"), plaintiffs Arcento Shelton and Carlos Ballentine ("plaintiffs") state:

PARTIES

- 1. Plaintiffs are each former employees of defendants.
- 2. Defendant Hyundai Subaru of Nashville, Inc. is a Tennessee corporation with its principal place of business at 1512 Broadway, Nashville, Davidson County, Tennessee. Defendant Hyundai Subaru of Nashville, Inc. can be served with process through its registered agent, CT Corporation System, 800 S. Gay Street, Suite 2021, Knoxville, Tennessee 37929-9710.
- 3. Defendant Martin Cadillac, Inc. is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business at 2201 Scottsdale Road, Bowling Green, Kentucky 42104. Defendant Martin Cadillac, Inc. does business as Martin Automotive Group and can be served with process through its registered agent, Elizabeth W. Burt, 1010 College Street, Bowling Green, Kentucky 42104.

- 4. Defendant Ron Reinhart is upon information and belief a resident of Davidson County Tennessee and a former management employee of defendants Hyundai Subaru of Nashville, Inc. and Martin Cadillac, Inc. Defendant Ron Reinhart may be served with process at his business address, Gary Mathews Nissan, 1100 Ashland City Road, Clarksville, Tennessee 37040..
- 5. Defendants operate for-profit, franchised automobile dealerships within the Middle District of Tennessee. At all relevant times, defendants employed more than 15 individuals, including plaintiffs.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 6. This is an action for damages and equitable relief for unlawful employment practices brought under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e, et seq., ("Title VII"); 42 U.S.C. § 1981 ("Section 1981"); and the Tennessee Human Rights Act, Tenn. Code Ann. § 4-21-101, et seq. ("THRA"). The Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1343(a)(4), and 1367(a). Venue is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1391.
- 7. Plaintiffs filed timely charges of discrimination with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission ("EEOC") and have received the attached Notices of Right to Sue ("Notice") from the EEOC.

FACTS

- 8. Plaintiffs were employed by defendants.
- 9. During plaintiffs' employment, defendants discriminated against plaintiffs because of their race with respect to the terms, conditions and privileges of employment, including paying plaintiffs less than similarly situated non-African-American employees, not paying plaintiffs money they had earned and providing plaintiffs less valuable benefits than

similarly situated non-African-American employees. Defendants' actions were in violation of Title VII, Section 1981 and the THRA.

- 10. During plaintiffs' employment, defendants created, allowed and failed to remedy a racially hostile work environment that altered plaintiffs' working conditions. Defendants' actions were in violation of Title VII, Section 1981 and the THRA.
- 11. Defendants retaliated against plaintiffs because of their opposition to defendants' racially offensive, inappropriate and unlawful actions, including repeated racially derogatory comments and racially offensive jokes, constantly referring to plaintiffs and other African-American employees as "you people" and "monkeys," and threats and other mistreatment. Defendants' actions were in violation of Title VII, Section 1981 and the THRA.
- 12. Defendants discriminated against plaintiffs on the basis of their race because of their opposition to defendants' racially offensive, inappropriate and unlawful actions, including repeated racially derogatory comments, threats and other mistreatment. Defendants' actions were in violation of Title VII, Section 1981 and the THRA.
- 13. After announcing that they were "going to get rid of" the African-American employees, defendants discharged or constructively discharged plaintiffs because of their race and/or their complaining about, opposing and/or refusing to participate in unlawful conduct.
- 14. Defendant Ron Reinhart retaliated and discriminated against plaintiffs because plaintiffs opposed defendants' discriminatory practices, in violation of Section 1981 and the THRA.
- 15. Defendant Ron Reinhart aided, abetted, incited, compelled and/or commanded persons, including those employed by him and the defendant companies he controlled, to engage in discriminatory practices, in violation of the THRA.

- 16. As a direct result of defendants' actions, plaintiffs have suffered damages.
- 17. As a result of their actions, defendants are liable to plaintiffs in an amount to be determined by the jury for the damages plaintiffs have incurred.
- 18. As a result of their actions, defendants are liable for punitive damages and for plaintiffs' attorneys' fees.
- 19. As a result of their actions, defendants are obligated to make plaintiffs whole for all lost earnings and benefits.

Claim for Race Discrimination, Racially Hostile Work Environment, and Retaliation in Violation of Federal and Tennessee Law (Against Defendants Hyundai Subaru of Nashville, Inc. and Martin Cadillac, Inc.)

- 20. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate and reallege the factual averments as set forth in paragraphs 1 through 19 herein.
- 21. Defendants discriminated against plaintiffs in the terms, conditions and privileges of their employment and discharged plaintiffs from their employment because of their race and/or in retaliation for their opposition to and/or refusal to participate in defendant's racially offensive, inappropriate and unlawful actions, including repeated racially derogatory comments, threats and other mistreatment, in violation of Title VII, Section 1981 and the THRA.
- 22. Defendants created, allowed and failed to remedy a racially hostile work environment that altered plaintiffs' working conditions in violation of Title VII, Section 1981 and the THRA.
- 23. Defendants retaliated against plaintiffs because of their opposition to defendants' racially offensive, inappropriate and unlawful actions, including repeated racially derogatory comments, threats and other mistreatment, in violation of Title VII, Section 1981 and the THRA.

- 24. As a result of their actions, defendants are liable to plaintiffs in an amount to be determined by the jury for the damages plaintiffs have incurred as well as for punitive damages.
 - 25. As a result of their actions, defendants are liable for plaintiffs' attorneys' fees.
- 26. As a result of their actions, defendants are obligated to make plaintiffs whole for all lost earnings and benefits.

Claim for Violation of Section 1981 and Tenn. Code Ann. § 4-21-301 (Against Defendant Ron Reinhart)

- 27. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate and reallege the factual averments as set forth in paragraphs 1 through 26 herein.
- 28. Defendant Ron Reinhart retaliated and discriminated against plaintiffs because plaintiffs opposed and/or refused to participate in defendants' discriminatory practices, in violation of Section 1981 and the THRA.
- 29. Defendant Ron Reinhart further aided, abetted, incited, compelled and/or commanded persons, including those employed by him and the defendant companies he controlled, to engage in discriminatory practices, in violation of the THRA.
- 30. As a direct result of defendant Ron Reinhart's actions, plaintiffs have suffered damages.
- 31. As a result of his actions, defendant Ron Reinhart is liable to plaintiffs in an amount to be determined by the jury for the damages plaintiffs have incurred.
- 32. As a result of his actions, defendant Ron Reinhart is liable for punitive damages and for plaintiffs' attorneys' fees.
- 33. As a result of his actions, defendant Ron Reinhart is obligated to make plaintiffs whole for all lost earnings and benefits.

WHEREFORE, premises considered, plaintiffs demand the following relief:

- 1. A jury trial and entry of judgment in their favor;
- 2. Back pay and damages for lost benefits;
- 3. Compensatory damages for embarrassment and humiliation, emotional pain and suffering and mental anguish, stress and anxiety, inconvenience, and loss of enjoyment of life;
 - 4. Reinstatement or, alternatively, front pay and damages for lost benefits;
 - 5. Punitive damages;
 - 6. Attorneys' fees and expenses;
 - 7. Prejudgment interest and, if applicable, post judgment interest; and
 - 8. Such other and further legal or equitable relief to which they may be entitled.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen W. Grace, (BPR No. 14867)

1019 16th Avenue, South

Nashville, Tennessee 37212

(615) 255-5225

Douglas B. Janney III (BPR No. 1911)

2002 Richard Jones Road

Suite B-200

Nashville, Tennessee 37215

(615) 742-5900

Attorneys for Plaintiff

U.S. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

To:	Arcento Shelton		

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO SUE (ISSUED ON REQUEST)

From: Nashville Area Office 220 Athens Way

Arcento Shelton	Su	Suite 350 Nashville, TN 37228		
On behalf of person(s)	aggrieved whose identity is	N-		
CONFIDENTIAL (29 C	EEOC Representative	Telephone No.		
EOC Charge No.		700 5050		
	Lu Ann Hawk,	(615) 736-5859		
94-2014-00574	Investigator (See also the	e additional information enclosed with this form.)		
een issued at your request. You f your receipt of this notice; of the law may be different.)	of 1964, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), or f 1964, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), or f Right to Sue, issued under Title VII, the ADA or GINA must be filed ar lawsuit under Title VII, the ADA or GINA must be filed by the filed of the ryour right to sue based on this charge will be lost. (The	e time limit for filing suit bases on a		
More than 180 day	ys have passed since the filing of this charge.	that it is unlikely that the EEOC will		
X Less than 180 day	is have passed since the filing of this charge, but when the its administrative processing within 180 days from the	filing of this charge.		
The EEOC is term	ninating its processing of this charge.			
The EEOC will co	ment Act (ADEA): You may sue under the ADEA at any that we have completed action on the charge. In this re	time from 60 days after the charge was filed the gard, the paragraph marked below applies to		
on dave allel vou lood.		A Land AM COSTO COULT WILLIAM		
your case: The EEOC is close	sing your case. Therefore, your lawsuit under the ADEA	ased on the above-numbered charge will be lost.		
30 DA19	ADEA case However, if 60	days have passed since the filing of the charge,		
The EEOC is con	ntinuing its handling of your ADEA case. However, if 60 in federal or state court under the ADEA at this time.			
VOII may file Suit	III leadial of same	CDA quite must be proug		
in federal of state search	eady have the right to sue under the EPA (filing an EEOC years (3 years for willful violations) of the alleged EPA unique than 2 years (3 years) before you file suit may be more than 2 years (3 years)			
If you file suit, based on this ch	arge, please send a copy of your court complaint to this of	nce.		
ii you iiio carri carri	On behalf of the Cor	mmission		
	Alus X Ha	APR 1 0 2014		
	prouvor, jos	(Date Mailed)		
Enclosures(s)	Sarah L. Smith, Area Office Directo	r		
cc: Tracy L. Moon,	GRAC	nen W. Grace CE RUDY 16th Avenue South		

Attorney at Law FISHER & PHILLIPS 1075 Peachtree Street NE Suite 3500 Atlanta, GA 30309

1019 16th Avenue South Nashville, TN 37212

U.S. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO SUE (ISSUED ON REQUEST)

	NOTICE	OF RIGHT TO GOZ (755			
To: Carlos	Ballentine		From:	Nashville Area Office 220 Athens Way Suite 350 Nashville, TN 37228	
	On behalf of person(s) aggrieved w CONFIDENTIAL (29 CFR §1601.7(hose identity is a))			Telephone No.
EEOC Charge		EEOC Representative			relephone No.
EEOC Charge	140.	Lu Ann Hawk,			(615) 736-5859
494-2014-0	0481	Investigator	(O alac	the additional information	on enclosed with this form.)
been issued a	E PERSON AGGRIEVED: This is your Notice of Right to Super Your request. Your lawsuit unit of this notice; or your right to be different.)	der Title VII, the ADA or GINA r o sue based on this charge will	be lost. (, or the Genetic Inform IA based on the above-n iled in a federal or state The time limit for filing su	ation Nondiscrimination umbered charge. It has a court WITHIN 90 DAYS wit based on a claim under
X	Less than 180 days have pass be able to complete its admini-	sed since the filing of this charge sed since the filing of this charge strative processing within 180 da	hut I has	ve determined that it is u the filing of this charge.	nlikely that the EEOC will
X	The EEOC is terminating its p	rocessing of this charge.			
	The EEOC will continue to pro	cess this charge.			ter the charge was filed until
90 days afte	nination in Employment Act (A	DEA): You may sue under the completed action on the charg			
your case:	The EEOC is closing your case	se. Therefore, your lawsuit unde this Notice . Otherwise, your rig	er the ADE ht to sue	EA must be filed in federal based on the above-numerous	nbered charge will be lost.
		andling of your ADEA case. How state court under the ADEA at the			
in federal or any violation	Act (EPA): You already have the state court within 2 years (3 years that occurred more than 2	e right to sue under the EPA (filin rs for willful violations) of the alle tyears (3 years) before you file	g an EEO ged EPA i e suit ma	y not be concount.) EPA suits must be blodging ans that backpay due for
If you file su	it, based on this charge, please s				
		On beha	of the C	commission with	APR 1 0 2014
Enclosure	s(s)	Sarah L Area Offic	Smith,	tor	(Date Mailed)

Tracy L. Moon, Jr.

Attorney at Law
FISHER & PHILLIPS
1075 Peachtree Street, NE
Suite 3500

Atlanta, GA 30309

Stephen W. Grace GRACE RUDY 1019 16th Avneue South Nashville, TN 37212